

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/765,518	01/19/2001	Gunther Herdin	TRG-289	9521	
7590 04/22/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
LORUSSO & LOUD 440 COMMERCIAL STREET			THOMPSON, KENNETH L		
BOSTON, MA	02109		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3672		

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/765,518	HERDIN ET AL.				
, and a second reason	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kenn Thompson	3672	\			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 05 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic	cation. A proper rep	ply to a			
· ·	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE e on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in statutory period for reply set in statutory period for set in statutory peri	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S 36(a) and the appropriate extensions of the final Office actions are	See MPEP e extension fee ension fee under			
1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal (eriod set forth in of the appeal.				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be						
(a) 🔲 they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) \square they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would						
canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: 6.	reconsideration has been cons	idered but does NO	T place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	s) a) will not be entered or b) will not be entered or b) will be rejected is provided belo	will be entered as	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			·			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>5,6,9-11,14-17 and 20</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>12,13,18 and 19</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b)□ disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
10. Other:	DA	WI BAGNELL				
	SUPERVISO TECHNO	Ry patent examini Logy center 3600	ER			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art teaching away from the claimed invention is not persuasive; "The use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain." In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Applicants arguments with respect to prior art lacking avoidance of a specific type of vibration is not supported by the pending claims.